



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,740	09/30/2005	Alexander Ralph Beeck	2002P19478WOUS	4282
28524 7590 05/08/2009 SIEMENS CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN, NJ 08830				
EXAMINER SANDERS, JAMES M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/08/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/551,740

**Applicant(s)**

BEECK ET AL.

**Examiner**

JAMES SANDERS

**Art Unit**

1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2009.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17, 18 and 20-28 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 17, 18 and 20-28 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9/30/05 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

In the reply filed April 8, 2009, claim 17 was amended, and claims 19 and 29-35 were cancelled.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 17, 20, 22, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lewis et al (US 5837960, already of record).

For claim 17, Lewis et al teach a process for producing a ceramic shaped object from ceramic powder (cl 1 lns 21-22 i.e. The present invention may be used to produce articles of any material which is obtainable in the form of a powder, and cl 21 lns 40-44 i.e. For example, turbine blades...might be fabricated...as the tip portion of the blade is formed, using an abrasion resistant material, such as carbide, boride..., and cl 21 lns 56-57 i.e. a hacksaw blade may be coated with tungsten carbide in the toothed section of the blade). Lewis et al also teach the process comprises: forming a first region of the shaped object by a first laser sintering of a first ceramic powder; and forming a second region of the shaped object integral with the first region by a second laser sintering of a second ceramic powder, wherein the forming of at least one of the first and second regions comprises controlling densification, porosity and surface roughness to provide

different material properties in the first and second regions of the shaped object and wherein additional layers of powder and additional steps of laser heating are added to form a ceramic shape in accordance with a shaped object (cl 3 lns 25-29 i.e. This invention is method...for forming articles from materials in particulate form in which the materials are melted by a laser beam and deposited at points along a tool path to form an article of the desired shape and dimensions, and cl 4 lns 20-21 i.e. Another object is to produce articles having variable density, and cl 22 lns 1-8 i.e. Decreasing laser power results in less melting of the powder, thus reducing density, and cl 4 lns 16-17 i.e. Another object is to produce articles of functionally graded composition, and cl 21 lns 39-40 i.e. DLF may be used to produce functionally graded articles by successive deposition of different powders, and cl 25 lns 41-43 i.e. A functionally graded material is a material which is formed by gradually altering composition from one location to another, and cl 21 lns 14-22 i.e. It is expected that smoother surfaces will be attained by use of powder of smaller size and by reducing the size of the powder spot. Rough surfaces might also be smoothed by laser ablation, using the laser in a pulsed mode to remove small amounts of material, or by passing the laser beam over the surface in order to melt a very thin surface layer). Examiner points out that as densification is controlled it is inherent that porosity is also controlled and vice versa. Finally, as cited above, Lewis et al teach that the melting is not necessarily complete and Examiner considers that the incomplete melting is equivalent to "sintering."

For claim 20, Lewis et al teach controlling a laser beam generated during the first and second laser sintering processes to produce a different sintering temperature over the

first and second regions of the object creating a different degree of densification in the first and second regions of the shaped object. (cl 22 lns 1-5 i.e. An article whose density varies, that is, has different densities at different locations, may be formed by varying laser power...Decreasing laser power results in less melting of the powder, thus reducing density). It would be inherent that areas subjected to different laser powers would have different temperatures. Also, Lewis et al teach different laser power levels for each material based on melting points (cl 17 lns 17-20).

For claim 22, Lewis et al teach accessing a computerized representation of the object and using the computerized representation to control the process for producing the ceramic shaped object (cl 15 lns 36-58 i.e. A CAD program is used to create a representation of an article in electronic digital form, that is, to create the design file).

For claims 25 and 26, Lewis et al teach using powder grain sizes of less than 30 micrometers (cl 13 lns 13-15 i.e. Powder sizes used in making articles with the three axis apparatus ranged from about 270 mesh (0.025 mm = 25 micrometers) to about 100 mesh (0.149 mm = 149 micrometers).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 18, 23-24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis et al.

For claim 18, Lewis et al do not explicitly teach a ceramic mold is formed. However, they do teach fabrication of dies (cl 4 lns 8-9) and fabrication of fixtures for use in conventional high-volume production of articles (cl 4 lns 9-10) and since a mold is an alternative for a die and because a mold can be used many times, fabrication of a mold having regions with dissimilar properties would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

For claims 23 and 24, Lewis et al do not explicitly teach the first region of the ceramic mold to comprise a shell and the second region of the ceramic mold to comprise a core disposed in a cavity of the shell, or the first region of the ceramic mold comprises an inner region and the second region of the ceramic mold comprises an outer region and the process is controlled so that the inner region is denser than the outer region of the mold. However, they do teach a method of fabrication of dies and fabrication of fixtures for use in conventional high-volume production of articles (see citations for claim 18

above) that is capable of forming a mold having these specific features and that would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

For claim 28, Lewis et al do not explicitly teach providing a surface in an inner region of the ceramic mold comprising a surface roughness different from an outer region of the ceramic mold. However, they do teach modifying surface roughness of the formed article (cl 21 lns 18-21 i.e. Rough surfaces might also be smoothed by laser ablation, using the laser in a pulsed mode to remove small amounts of material, or by passing the laser beam over the surface in order to melt a very thin surface layer) and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a surface in an inner region of the ceramic mold comprising a surface roughness different from an outer region of the ceramic mold.

6. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis et al, and further in view of Deckard (US 4863538, already of record).

Lewis et al do not teach at least one of an additional laser sintering process and a hot isostatic pressing of the ceramic mold to achieve any further densification.

However, in the same field of endeavor pertaining to producing ceramic objects by laser sintering, Deckard teaches post formation treatments including heat treatment for the objects produced (cl 6 ln 55 to cl 7 ln 2 i.e. some type of parts may require certain material properties which can be achieved by heat treating).

Also, Lewis et al teach an operative principle that the amount of heat applied influences density (cl 22 lns 7-8 i.e. The operative principle is that a reduction in heat input per unit

of mass causes a reduction in density) so that an increase in heat input per unit of mass causes an increase in density. Further, Lewis et al teach an increased density of hot-pressed powder compared to cold-pressed powder (cl 13 lns 9-11 i.e. that of cold-pressed powder is usually about 50 to 55% (of theoretical density of the material) and that of hot-pressed powder is usually 80% or more).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Deckard with those of Lewis et al for benefit of achieving further densification by hot isostatic pressing.

7. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis et al, and further in view of Loschau (Ceramics: Getting into the 2000's, already of record).

Lewis et al do not teach the ceramic powder comprises at least one ingredient that affects densification and/or sintering of the ceramic powder by producing a liquid phase for at least one of the regions of the object.

However, in the same field of endeavor pertaining to producing ceramic objects by laser sintering, Loschau teaches the ceramic powder comprises at least one ingredient that affects densification and/or sintering of the ceramic powder by producing a liquid phase for at least one of the regions of the object (pg 568 paragraph 1 i.e. Experiments are known on indirect laser sintering of  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  and  $\text{SiC}$  with low-melting binder...).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Loschau with those of Lewis et al for benefit of



using more complex mixtures that would impart certain targeted properties to the produced ceramic object.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed April 8, 2009 were fully considered and are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts for claim 17 that Lewis does not teach "controlling densification, porosity and surface roughness to provide different material properties in the first and second regions of the shaped object" and MPEP 2131 requires "to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." However, as stated in the claim 17 rejection above, Lewis does teach controlling densification and surface roughness and as densification is controlled it is inherent that porosity is also controlled and vice versa.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES SANDERS whose telephone number is 571-270-7007. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Del Sole can be reached on 571-272-1130. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMS

/Joseph S. Del Sole/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791